DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 815 SP 009 510

AUTHOR Clark, David L.
TITLE Federal Policy in Educational Research and Development. Occasional Paper No. 5.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE 1 Aug 74
NOTE 17p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210 (No price quoted)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Development; *Educational Legislation; *Educational Policy; *Educational Research; Federal Government; *Federal Legislation; Financial Policy

ABSTRACT

In 1867, a bill was passed by Congress establishing a department of education. The appropriations for the department were reduced almost immediately, and the status of the agency was undercut by reassigning it as an office in the Department of Interior. From 1867 to 1954, the United States Office of Education (USOE) and the federal government were bystanders in the field of educational research. The first breakthrough in federal policy toward educational research and development (R and D) came with the passage of the Cooperative Research Act in 1954. This Act authorized the commissioner of education to enter into "contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities and colleges and state educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education." In 1965, a second major breakthrough in educational R and D occurred with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The new programs brought about by the Act typified the expansionist mood of the 1960's. It was within this mood that the National Institute of Education (NIE) was established to coordinate the government's investment in R and D. Today the policy of the federal government is more comprehensive, vigorous, and supportive than any previous policy or combination of policies have been. However, there is considerable doubt about and dissatisfaction with the federal dollar investment in educational R and D in both the executive and legislative branches of the government. (Lecture questions and answers are included.) (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED118615

Occasional Paper No. 5

FEDERAL POLICY IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

OCT 6 1975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

David L. Clark, Professor

College of Education

Indiana University

The Center for Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

August 1, 1974

SP004 510

PREFACE

We are indebted to Dr. David Clark, professor, College of Education, Indiana University, for presenting a Graduate Lecture at The Ohio State University on the topic, "Federal Policy in Educational Research and Development" while he was a visiting scholar at The Center for Vocational Education. Dr. Clark's experience and background in educational research and development uniquely qualify him to treat the topic with considerable authority and insight from both a historical and futuristic perspective.

Dr. Clark's presentation describes historical elements relating to federal R & D policy and the establishment of priorities for funding. Considerable attention is devoted to the consequences of policy decisions on building a research and development capacity in education.

Dr. Clark has a rich and extensive background in educational R & D and administration. A native of Binghamton, New York, he received a B.A. (1951) and M.A. (1952) from New York State College for Teachers, Albany, New York, and the Doctor of Education degree (1954) from Teacher's College, Columbia University. Dr. Clark is presently a professor in the College of Education at Indiana University having served as dean of Indiana University's College of Education (1966 - 1974), and as an administrator at the local, state, university, and federal levels. He began his career as a field representative for the New York State Teachers Association. For the next two years he was assistant to the superintendent of the Garden City Public Schools (N.Y.). From 1958 through 1962 he was director of the USOE Cooperative Research Program. He left government to become associate dean and professor at The Ohio State University where he served until he became dean at Indiana.

Among his numerous publications, Clark co-authored Organizing Schools for Effective Education, Educational Administration, and Preparing Research Personnel for Education. Currently, he is co-director of an NIE-funded project entitled, "A Futures Analysis of Teacher Education Institutions as Innovators, Knowledge Producers, and Change Agents in the Nation's Educational R & D System."

Clark holds or has held numerous editorial board positions and key assignments on national associations, including the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, American Educational Research Association, and the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

The Ohio State University and The Center for Vocational Education is honored in sharing with you Dr. David Clark's presentation, "Federal Policy in Educational Research and Development."

Robert E. Taylor, Director
The Center for Vocational Education

FEDERAL POLICY IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

In January 1972, Francis S. Chase charted for the Committee on Education and Labor of the U.S. House of Representatives what he noted was an "incredible chronology" of dates involving the United States Office of Education's twenty regional educational laboratories.[1] This laboratory program, he pointed out, was authorized on April 11, 1965 with the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. By August of that year the office had issued guidelines for prospectuses which, in turn, were due in the office on October 15, 1965. By February of 1966 the first contracts for laboratories were negotiated and by September of 1966 twenty such laboratories were under operational or developmental contracts.

On November 18, 1966, roughly a year after the first prospectuses had been received, nine months after the first contract had been let, while a majority of the laboratories were not yet operational, the criticism of the laboratories had reached such a level that the so-called "Chase Study" was commissioned by the Secretary of HEW and the Commissioner of Education to gather, ". . . trustworthy information to determine action with respect to the new laboratories which were being assailed so strongly by critics within and without the educational establishment."[2] Chase noted:

> "It seems scarcely credible that disillusionment could have set in so quickly as to shake the faith of the Secretary who earlier (when president of the Carnegie Corporation) had chaired the Presidential Task Force which recommended the establishment of such laboratories as large-scale research and development organizations. Yet the painful fact was that the existence of these new organizations was threatened before a majority of them became fully operational."[3]

This was not the first instance of quick disillusionment setting in after the initiation of a new federal initiative in education. After the passage of the bill establishing a department of education in March 1867, President Andrew Johnson appointed Dr. Henry Barnard as the first Commissioner of Education on March 11, 1867. On July 20, 1868, less than two months after Dr. Barnard submitted his first annual report to Congress, the appropriation to the new agency was reduced from

---

[1] Francis S. Chase, "Educational Research and Development in the Sixties: The Mixed Report Card" in Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Educational Research: Prospects and Priorities (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972), pp. 1 - 2.

[2] Ibid., p. 2.

[3] Ibid., p. 2.

$12,000 per year to $9,400 and the appropriations act further undercut the status of the agency by reassigning it as an office in the Department of Interior. One of Barnard's successors, John Tigert, noted in reference to the loss of funds, status, and Barnard's impending resignation that:

> "It is clear that the expectations of some of the Congressional advocates of the Department of Education were not realized. It is no wonder. In fulsome speeches it had been proclaimed—that the Department of Education would exert a powerful influence to enlighten the mass of ignorance in the Nation, particularly among the freedmen of the South. Two years passed, and the Commissioner of Education with his three clerks had failed to cause the enlightenment of the four million freedmen or to show any appreciable reduction in the sum total of ignorance in the country at large. It was disappointing to the enthusiasts, and the reaction had its natural effect."[4]

But we need not look beyond this summer's newspapers to illustrate further the point of these two examples. On June 28, 1974, in a feature story on the National Institute of Education, the Wall Street Journal reported on the current difficulties being encountered by the agency as follows:

> "Launched in an outpouring of enthusiasm when the Nixon administration was riding high, the National Institute of Education was to become the leading edge of education progress in the U.S.
>
> Freed from the supposedly stultifying surroundings of the federal Office of Education, the government's newest research agency was intended to plumb fundamental problems of the U.S. education system. As a worthy companion to the famed National Institutes of Health, or so the reasoning went, N.I.E. would ultimately provide answers helping to revolutionize teaching from kindergarten to college.
>
> 'This effort in education will be an historic step forward,' the President promised. Daniel P. Moynihan, its prime architect insisted that eager educators would rush to adopt its recommendations simply because of its prestige.
>
> Now two years later, this infant institution is in trouble. It is still seeking to become accepted in academic circles; educators are suspicious of its reformist bent or dismayed at its fumbling performance. 'They need to really accomplish something,' warns Stanley McFarland, a National Education Association official.
>
> And the institute is perilously close to flunking the test that matters most: gaining political support in Congress. The law makers, indifferent or antagonistic, have difficulty even in understanding N.I.E.'s purpose. 'We just get all this soft mushy education jargon that doesn't tell us a damn thing,' complains Rep. David Obey, a liberal Democrat from Wisconsin.

---

[4] John J. Tigert, "An Organization By the Teachers and For the Teachers," School Life 9 (May 1924), p. 196.

As a result, the N.I.E. found its first-year budget whacked in half, and now it is fighting to survive and get its ambitious endeavors moving."[5]

The evening before this article was published, the House voted to overrule its own committee's recommendation that the NIE budget for FY '75 be restored to $100 million offsetting partially the sharp cut in funds in FY '74. Instead, the House approved $80 million - less than was appropriated for educational R and D three years earlier in the "stultifying surroundings" of USOE. Subsequently, the Senate approved only $65 million throwing the final appropriation to conference committee, and the Director of the Institute submitted his resignation effective October 15, 1974.[6]

An Historical Perspective

What can be inferred from these cases spread over a hundred year time span? One might conclude that there is no policy at the federal level in regard to educational R and D or at least that little coherent and consistent policy has emerged. This lack of coherence is then reflected in tactical ambivalence which causes both the legislative and executive branches to engage in "fits and starts" in support of educational R and D reflecting transitory optimism and rapid disillusionment. There is more than a grain of truth in such inferences but they do not capture what has happened, where we are, and where we might be going at the federal level because the cases fail to provide an historical perspective from which to view the question.

The First Hundred Years

Despite the evidence of the Barnard case example, the Congressmen in 1867 who supported the establishment of a national Department of Education did concern themselves with a policy posture for the new agency in educational R and D. Specifically, they charged the department with responsibility for:

> ". . . collecting such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and of diffusing such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems, the methods of teaching, as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems. . . ."[7]

---

[5] Johnathan Spivak, "Lack of Political Clout Threatens Once-Glamorous National Institute of Education," Wall Street Journal (June 28, 1974), p. 36.

[6] Between the time this lecture was delivered and prepared for publication, the appropriation for FY '75 was approved at $70 million ($5 million less than FY '74) and the chairman of the Institute's Council resigned both the chairmanship and his appointment to The Council.

[7] United States, An Act to Establish a Department of Education, 39th Congress, 2nd Session, March 2, 1867.

And this statement was not treated casually by American educational commissioners or their staffs. This was, in effect, the policy of the federal government in educational R and D for eighty-seven years. The first portion of the statement, i.e., the social bookkeeping function, led to the establishment of the statistics unit in USOE and these activities have persisted until today as a core function that characterizes an unambiguous dimension of federal governmental policy in educational R and D.[8] The dissemination function was handled by organizing the Office of Education around substantive specialists in, for example, mathematics, science, English, elementary education, school organization and administration, etc., who communicated with schools and school personnel through professional association contacts and periodic special subject bulletins. This pattern of organization at the federal level reached its apex under the long tenure of Commissioner John Studebaker, appointed by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1934, who continued in the Commissioner's role until after World War II (1948). That Commissioner Studebaker understood and was responding to the defined policy stance of 1867 is well illustrated by his own description of the Office's activities in 1944 when he was urging consideration of reorganization for the Office, to wit:

> "For many years the Office of Education has conducted searches, carried on studies, made surveys and investigations, published reports and otherwise sought to disseminate its findings in order to help the people of the States to improve their systems of education. It has issued numerous bulletins and other publications dealing with a variety of educational problems. . . ."[9]

During this extended period of rigid adherence to the policy statement of 1867, it might be said that USOE and the federal government were bystanders as the field of educational research moved through its early emphasis on philosophic inquiry; to its predominant concern with psychologically based empiricism and the study of scientific management; to the demonstrators and reformers of the 1930's.

1954: The Watershed Years

A low point for the educational research community occurred during and immediately following World War II. But the federal government's interest in the support of social and behavioral science inquiry was not at all dormant. The concern of the military in the screening, placement, training, counseling, and rehabilitation of personnel was stimulating the support of substantial research and development thrusts of relevance to education in aptitude and intelligence testing, occupational analysis, counseling, and short term efficient and effective personnel training programs. And immediately after the war, behavioral science research continued to be supported by the Army, the Air Force, and the Office of Naval Research while simultaneously the National Institute of Health and the National Science Foundation were experiencing rapid growth patterns in funds to support behavioral research. If one wanted to sell the notion that the human state could be enhanced through systematic social and behavioral inquiry, Washington was a good place to be in the early 50's.

---

[8] Congress has not, however, expressed consistently their approval of the adequacy with which the policy has been carried out. As a matter of fact, the Omnibus School-aid Bill signed by President Ford on August 21, 1974 carried a provision which upgraded the National Center for Educational Statistics and placed it in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education rather than in USOE.

[9] John W. Studebaker, Plan of Organization to Improve the Service of the U.S. Office of Education (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, August 1944, Unpublished), p. 4.

It was almost inevitable that USOE was going to take advantage of this mood and the agency did. Shortly after Dr. Samuel Brownell was appointed Commissioner in 1953, he stated:

> "If I were asked to name the one field in which the Office can be of greatest service at this time, I should answer 'educational research.' "[10]

With this interest uppermost in his mind he achieved the first breakthrough in federal policy toward educational research and development in eighty-seven years with the passage of the Cooperative Research Act (P. L. 531) which authorized the commissioner of education to enter into "contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities and colleges and state educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education."[11]

This landmark legislation did not exactly take Washington by storm. Its shaky early history illustrates the persistent ambivalence of Congress toward the likelihood of payoff from systematic inquiry in education.[12] The authorization was not funded for two years. Finally in 1956, $1 million was appropriated to support P. L. 531. But there was a "hooker" in the appropriation. Two-thirds of the funds were to be expended on the study of education for the mentally retarded with one-third left over for the remainder of education's problems. Through the authorization of P. L. 531, Congress was modifying for the first time the policy statement of 1867. Congress seemed on the one hand to be recognizing the feasibility of improving the educational system in the United States through research; the desirability of attempting to do so; and the responsibility of the federal government to assume the initiative and the cost. However, on the other hand, by holding off appropriations for two years, eventually appropriating a total support figure far below that of other federal behavioral and social science programs, Congress was expressing serious doubts in regard to whether anything could be learned about education through systematic inquiry; whether educational R and D was a feasible route to school improvement; and whether the federal government had any significant role to play in the educational R and D scene.

Twenty Years of Growth: 1954-1974

Subsequent to 1956, when the first appropriation was made available through P. L. 531, the general flow of legislative authorizations and appropriations for educational R and D seemed to signal unmitigated success. In 1958 the National Defense Education Act was passed with provisions for the support of research on language and media. Outside USOE the National Science

---

[10] Samuel Brownell, U.S. Office of Education Handbook (Washington, D.C., 1955), p. 2.

[11] United States, An Act to Authorize Cooperative Research in Education, Public Law 531, Chapter 576, 83rd Congress, July 26, 1954.

[12] To be fair it should probably be noted that the ambivalent attitude of Congress toward educational inquiry is a subset of responses within a broader reluctance on the part of Congress to become involved in the educational scene generally-what Stephen Bailey has typified colorfully as ". . . the hoary notion that the federal government should leave the direction of education to the mercies of pluralistic and often contentious centers of decentralized authority." See, Stephen K. Bailey, "Significance of the Federal Investment in Educational R and D," Journal of Research and Development in Education 2 (Summer, 1969), p. 34.

Foundation was provided with the first major development funds in education to reconceptualize, design, and diffuse new curricula in mathematics and science. Not to be outdone, USOE extended its program into the "D" portion of educational R and D through Projects Social Studies and English, and used the newly popular educational R and D theme to attract additional funds in specialized areas, e.g., the authorization to support vocational education research under the Vocational Education Act of 1963. P. L. 531 itself was used as the vehicle for a new departure in capacity building in educational research - the establishment of nine federally-funded R and D centers attached to universities. USOE's divisions in vocational education and education for the handicapped followed suit by establishing R and D centers in these specialized fields.

The second major breakthrough for educational R and D occurred in 1965 with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Titles III and IV of this legislation broadened the authorization for federal programs in support of education R and D to the point where almost any program could be initiated from a structural point of view for which appropriations could be obtained. The new programs actually initiated ranged from the direct support of experiments in local education agencies to university-based training programs for educational researchers. An example of the expansionist mood surrounding federal support for educational R and D in the mid-sixties could be noted in a government review of the Cooperative Research Program just a year preceding the passage of ESEA which noted that in the first few years the program "had stimulated qualitative improvement and quantitative expansion in educational research." However it also noted that "(1) the results of the projects. . . did not lead directly enough or quickly enough to observable change and desired improvement in educational practice and (2) . . . the results of small scale project research tended to be fragmented, non-cumulative, and inconclusive."[13]

This problem was about to be solved! Twenty-one R and D centers were established - ten with their own content emphases and eleven focused on high priority government areas; twenty regional laboratories were set up to develop products and to interface with schools; over 100 R and D graduate training programs were established in institutions of higher education; USOE developed a storage and retrieval system (ERIC) for educational information and research; literally thousands of Title III projects were funded in local school districts and the federal investment in educational R and D (loosely defined) was approaching $200 million.

In the midst of this rapid growth pattern, a long held vision of a National Institute of Education which would coordinate the government's investment in educational R and D (and hopefully take unto itself the aura of prestige and support which characterized NIH and NSF) became a reality under the Congressional leadership of John Brademas of Indiana, and accompanying the Institute was a new policy statement in the Education Amendments Act of 1972 which declared it to be the policy of the United States to:

"(i) Help to solve or to alleviate the problems of, and promote the reform and renewal of, American education;

---

[13] Building Capacity for Renewal and Reform (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, December 1973), pp. 9-10.

(ii) Advance the practice of education, as an art, science, and profession;

(iii) Strengthen the scientific and technological foundations of education; and

(iv) Build an effective educational research and development system."[14]

The Growth Years: A Researcher's View

Could there be any remaining doubt that the federal government had made its commitment and taken its stand? From an operational perspective in a regional laboratory or R and D center or institution of higher education, the R and D practitioner in education had a somewhat different view of the federal commitment. As a matter of fact, the recipient of the government's largesse over the past decade was likely to have some horror stories to relate:

— If he or she happened to be located in a regional educational laboratory or an R and D center the chances are better than one in three that the lab or center was closed permanently during this period.

— If the agency survived, it was converted from government support of the center as an extension of the federal level capacity to produce R and D in education, i.e., institutional support, to a program purchase plan under which organizational survival was based-upon its competitiveness for piecework under NIE's requests for proposals.

— If he or she were located in an institution of higher education receiving project support he saw individual project support atrophy, while total educational R and D funds seemed to be increasing substantially.

— If she ran a research training program she saw the program collapse just as the first graduates were produced.

— If he or she were in any of these settings he experienced a different set of signals from the National Center for Educational Research and Development and subsequently NIE every time a site visit was scheduled or the federal agency was reorganized (circa every six months).

The process of disassembling, closing out, modifying, and rebuilding programs in educational R and D for the past decade has been undertaken (as Chase noted in the earlier-cited example of the laboratories) almost at the instant that significant funds have become available for the particular program. The bulk of the blame was laid, even by astute observers, at the door of USOE and its National Center for Educational Research and Development. The problem was perceived as primarily structural and the proposed amelioration was NIE. So, for example, two years ago Francis Chase was offering this testimony in behalf of establishing the new agency:

---

[14] Ibid., p. 1.

"Deficiencies in national planning, management, support and evaluation are a continuing impediment to realization of the full potential of educational R and D. These shortcomings spring largely from the failure to place educational R and D in charge of an adequately funded agency at a level in the government hierarchy comparable to the National Science Foundation or the National Institute of Health."[15]

If NIE was or is a necessary condition for progress in federal policies and programs for educational R and D it surely was insufficient. On all fronts the situation has worsened since the establishment of NIE. Not only has NIE not achieved the status of an NSF or NIH, it has not even retained the status of NCERD. The fiscal support base for educational R and D has not increased over the past two years, it has diminished. The year before the authorization of NIE, NCERD had a budget of $96.8 million and was requesting $110.8 for FY '72. By FY '75, NIE's budget level had descended to $70 million. NIE is publicly under attack by Congress in both the House and the Senate and its very existence is threatened as it approaches its date of re-authorization - July 1, 1975.

An Assessment and Projection

That brings the story up to the fall of 1974. And undoubtedly leaves the reader wondering about the current status of federal policy in educational R and D. At a general level of discourse that is an easy question to answer. The policy charter is the four-point mandate to NIE which was noted earlier. That is surely not a bad charter under which to be operating. But to cast that policy statement in more operational terms it would be well to be reminded of the nature of governmental policy which was expressed cogently and simply by Stephen Bailey and associates in their case study of school politics in the Northeast:

"Some people want something from government and build a coalition of influence to get it; other people want something different and build a coalition of influence to block or modify the designs of the first group; strategic and tactical campaigns are fought; constitutional wielders of power determine winners and losers by laws passed and executive and judicial actions taken. The process is never-ending. As soon as a governmental decision is made a new dialectic begins."[16]

The educational R and D community wanted a broad extension of support for educational R and D, and they wanted a National Institute of Education. With the strong support of certain Congressional leaders they won those tactical campaigns. But they may have missed two other

---

[15] Francis S. Chase, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

[16] Stephen K. Bailey, Richard T. Frost, Paul E. Marsh, and Robert C. Wood, Schoolmen and Politics (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1962), p. 57.

critical notations of Bailey's (1) that non-constitutional wielders of power in the executive branch would interpret and administer the programs and (2) the new dialectic about the proper role of the federal government in educational R and D began the day each of the laws was passed and is continuing right now. It is perfectly within the realm of possibility (although I think it highly improbable) that NIE and the 1972 policy statement in regard to educational R and D will be thrown out lock, stock, and barrel on July 1, 1975. Federal policy in a broad sense and federal programs in their specifics are obviously volatile propositions. Unless the federal government retreats from the scene altogether or delimits its involvement as sharply as the Act of 1867, there will never again be a consistent posture of federal policy for educational R and which will survive for eighty-seven years.

Let me try, then in summary form to note where educational R and D is and where it is likely to be going:

— The current policy of the federal government in support of educational R and D is more comprehensive, vigorous, and supportive than any previous policy or combination of policies have been in this arena.

— The policy is a thinly-veiled mask thrown over considerable doubt about and dissatisfaction with the federal dollar investment in educational R and D which is held within both the executive and legislative branches.

— The battle may have been won in answering in general terms the question as to whether more can be learned about education through systematic inquiry (general legislative history of the past twenty years would seem to indicate that is true); but decision-makers have not been convinced that what is learned has or will improve schools (as demonstrated by a willingness to forego R and D expenditures as budget crises emerge and/or to jump from program type to program type as educational impact seem lethargic.

— Everyone should now be convinced that the problems of mounting and sustaining an efficient and effective federal level program in educational R and D will not be solved by organization and reorganization inside or without the Office of Education or the National Institute of Education.

— Educational R and D is still a federal educational policy arena without a constituency. This continuing difficulty is more nearly the explanation for the vacillation in and underfunding of federal programs in R and D than either structural (i.e., organizational) problems or the debate over what is or is not being produced by educational R and D.

— The field is caught currently in a critical shortage of funds which runs the danger of elevating the competition for funds into what appears to be a solid intellectual debate over research strategies and tactics, e.g., support of development vs. research, institutional support vs. program purchase, etc. This is no time to settle such issues when their genesis is more than likely lack of funds to support necessary diverse efforts.

— The current and immediate past leadership of NIE has lost the confidence of Congress, on the one hand, and its field constituencies on the other. This should not be interpreted as a sufficient explanation for the current state of affairs. The sharp reductions and eliminations in the

laboratory program, the research training support, Title III, and individual project support preceded NIE and its leadership. The problem is more pervasive than an individual or group of individuals in leadership positions in an agency.

— The current attacks on the credibility of educational R and D are not new, will not go away in the next few years, and can only be coped with by continually engaging a diverse set of educational constituencies in the dialectic about educational R and D.

— Every new administration (and every new administrator) wants his "thing" and needs discretionary funds to obtain it. There is no absolute defense against this inconstancy in federal behavior but the best defense yet devised is a vocal constituency that negotiates the changes and their magnitude with "the new face in town."

— If all goes well with educational R and D over the next two years, little will occur either in modifying the mandate for the field or in appropriations to support the field, i.e., educational R and D will be fortunate to hold its own fiscally; reaffirm the current broad policy statement of Congress; prevent the executive branch from cannibalizing extant programs to offer the appearance of new initiatives; and set the stage for a point in time two or three years from now (FY '77 or '78) when some significant progress on increased support and program revitalization may be possible. This short range future would represent a successful tactical campaign.

— To achieve even these limited goals will require a solid coalition including diverse interests and emphases, e.g., American Educational Research Association, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, National Education Association, National Council of Chief State School Officers, American Federation of Teachers, Council for Educational Development and Research, Deans of Schools and Colleges of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, National School Boards Association, American Association of School Administrators, etc. Such a coalition has never existed in the past but is a must for the present and future.

— The basis for this coalition will have to be built upon a reconceptualization of the role of R and D in education which will diversify the types of and sites for productivity in educational R and D. The process of inquiry will have to be brought closer to the point of effective action in education, i.e., will involve the direct participation of practitioner agencies in all the processes of educational R and D. The negotiation required to form the coalition will not success so long as some principals to negotiation continue to insist upon narrow definitions of Ran Das, for example, local education agencies being viewed as target systems and state education agencies being viewed as tangential to or an impediment in the diffusion process.[17]

— It is not unreasonable to imagine that anational conference board (similar in intent if not in structure to the New York State Educational Conference Board which worked so effectively in

---

[17] For an amplification of this point of view see: Egon G. Guba and David L. Clark, The Configurational Perspective: A New View of Educational Knowledge Production and Utilization (Washington, D.C.: Council for Educational Development and Research, 1975).

mobilizing a state platform for school support in New York)[18] could be organized to formulate a national policy and action platform for educational R and D. If this turns out not to be feasible, the current pattern of under-funding and vacillation from program to program will continue indefinitely. Federal decision-makers will continue to view educational R and D as a form of social action in education.[19] Social action goals will not be attained unless the major actors are represented vigorously in the process.

---

[18] Stephen K. Bailey, et al., Schoolmen and Politics, op. cit., pp. 36-7.

[19] For additional detail on this view see: Hendrik D. Gideonse, Social Science Policy and the Federal Government (Washington, D.C.: Memorandum to Committee on Science and Astronautics, August 14, 1974).

CLARK LECTURE QUESTIONS

1. What are the likely prospects of orchestrating the joint effort across such diverse groups as those mentioned?

   I think the prospects are very good. Recall that just this past year the Council for Educational Development and Research (CEDR) and the National Council of Chief State School Officers (on the face of it an unlikely alliance) were able to formulate and promote successfully the joint sponsorship of a diffusion program which would have operated within NIE. The alliance was held together by the fact that neither of the two organizations tried to compromise out something that was needed and wanted by the other organization. The National Education Association, National School Boards Association, American Association of School Administrators have all adopted resolutions in the recent past supportive of NIE with nothing promised or offered in return. If they had input to the programs and policies of the agency I think they would be more than casually supportive. But this will require, as I noted in the paper, some basic re-orientation in thinking by some who still consider R and D the province of colleges and universities or centers and labs. I think necessity will cause it to happen.

2. What do you project might be the role of local and state education agencies in educational R and D in the future?

   There is no question in my mind but that LEAs and SEAs will play a central role in both knowledge production and knowledge utilization. As a matter of fact, the trend is already with us. Titles I and III of ESEA made it clear that educational R and D funds were not going to remain in Washington to be employed as the exclusive province of R and D agencies. The emphasis on revenue sharing in general fiscal policy is just another indication that the locus of federal dollars has and will change. The more important reason, however, from my point of view is that diversification of R and D functions, sites, and tactics is a necessity if we are to appeal to a more diversified constituency and educational R and D must have that constituency. In the future, I expect to see LEAs and SEAs operating educational R and D programs which are complementary to those being conducted in more formal research sites.

3. How much is the need for educational R and D appreciated by educators generally? Aren't there many in leadership positions who contend that we just need more money to do what we already know how to do?

   Obviously the current base of support is too narrow. It is probably true that most classroom teachers in the country are not convinced of the utility of educational R and D even when, in some instances, they are using products that come out of the R and D community in their own classrooms? The argument that we already know so mucy more than we are doing that our problem is diffusion not research has been with us since the inception of governmental level support for research. Unfortunately, I think, our response to these challenges has too often been one of exhortation and public relations. We will have to demonstrate rather than exhort.

Knowledge production and utilization programs need to be supported at the local level where teacher-leaders are participants. We should agree with those who contend that we have a vein of untapped knowledge and press for complementary emphases on knowledge utilization and diffusion programs which will, by their success, demand more not less emphasis on systematic inquiry.

4. Isn't it true that we will never make much progress until we mobilize the teachers in support of R and D in education? Aren't those in preservice teacher education programs an especially useful group - a captive audience that can be attuned to inquiry?

Yes and no, to both questions. It is probably unrealistic to assume that two and a half million teachers will pick up R and D in education as a prime legislative target when one considers the range of other legislative concerns closer to their personal interests. I think, however, that is not unrealistic to assume that the NEA and AFT could be convinced to assume national level leadership for the teachers in at least elevating the legislative priority for R and D if they felt the organized teaching profession had some voice in policy and program directions for R and D in education; and, I suppose, if they felt that the programs were having a positive effect at the local level. If a prime interest at the national level is in demonstrating the efficacy of voucher plans and accountability programs, the R and D community can probably anticipate further letters of congratulation from teacher organizations to Congress when funds are reduced. The preservice audience seems to me not very promising. Obviously I would hope that the preservice experience would utilize the products of educational R and D and would stimulate the trainees to use inquiry techniques in their professional careers. But if the studies from the Texas R and D Center are examined in terms of teacher trainee needs, I would conclude that this is not an optimal learning period for the teacher. Their personal insecurities are so high and so much in need of amelioration that I would suspect their interest in educational R and D directed toward improved learning environments for students might be very low.

5. Would the kind of coalition you're talking about be effective in communicating to Congress the long range need for research in education and the little that has actually been invested in educational R and D?

That all depends, I guess, on the approach the coalition used toward Congress. I surely would not begin by contrasting the espenditures on educational R and D with those in other fields to demonstrate how niggardly Congress has been to date. The Congress has figures from USOE, NIE, and the testimony of experts going back twenty years estimating that from 1/10th to 4/10ths of 1 percent of the expenditures in education go to R and D, and that that percentage is lower than every other field from agriculture, space, and medicine to the development of plastic spoons. Those who are already core supporters of R and D in education in Congress don't need more of this general information and those who are unconvinced will not become convinced by these data. We need a constituency which the coalition might provide. We need products that are attractive and interesting; and data about the number of children in each congressional district who are using the materials. We need testimony from educational agencies of all types in the various districts who are participating actively in programs of diffusion, research, and development. We need examples that the Congressmen can use in their own presentations to their constituencies about the utility of a program they have supported or are

being asked to support. We need to provide ammunition that can be used by the core of Congressmen that are already convinced about our case when they are, in turn, attempting to convince their colleagues.

6. What about research training? What is the long term future for building up a cadre of sophisticated R and D specialists?

That really strikes me as a particularized version of the more general question of the long range prospects for educational R and D. Support for training programs will follow not lead support for R and D generally. As most of you know the training programs initiated under ESEA Title IV are essentially dead. The field provided a good setting for training from 1966 to 1971 beacuse of the rapid increase in support for educational R and D in general. Fortunately the cadre of young men and women who entered the field during that period were considerably below the average age of persons entering graduate work in education in the previous ten years. This group has infiltrated institutions of higher education (especially schools and colleges of education) and are likely to have a positive influence on upgrading inquiry training programs in graduate school settings for some time to come. I think there is no realistic hope for a revival of significant support on the part of the federal government for training research personnel in education in the foreseeable future.